

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/568,650	02/16/2006	Richard Bernard Silberstein	S157570000US00 2694		
23628 WOLF GREEN	23628 7590 10/16/2007 WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.			EXAMINER	
600 ATLANTI	C AVENUE		NASSER, ROBERT L		
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3735		
				·	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/568,650	SILBERSTEIN, RICHARD BERNARD			
omee near canmary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robert L. Nasser	3735			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 10-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5-9 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the conference of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
	4				
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/5/2006. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te			

Claims 5-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett 3809069 in view of Gevins et al 6434419. Bennett shows a method of evaluating the intelligence of a user by providing a stimulus to a user, recording the brain activity of the user while the stimulus is presented, deriving the SSVEP amplitudes from the brain activity, and comparing the amplitudes to known SSVEP amplitudes to identify the intelligence of the user. The stimulus is not a group of tasks. However, Gevins teaches that it is known to derive a measure of intelligence from SSVEP signals obtained by using a group of tasks as the stimulus. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify Bennett to use the stimulus of Gevins as the stimulus, as it is merely the substitution of one known equivalent stimulus from another. The examiner notes that the intelligence of a person is the aptitude to perform any cognitive task. Claim 2 is rejected in that the known SSVEP data is obtained by showing the same group of tasks to individuals. Claim 3 is rejected in that the tasks of Gevins present similar demands on the user as the predetermined task. Claim 4 is rejected in that the tasks of Gevins

include working memory. Claim 10 is rejected in that the combination also has the structure. Claims 11 –12 are rejected in that Gevins further teaches sending the data for analysis over the internet to a remote location. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify Bennett to use such a processing technique, as it is merely the substitution of one known processing technique for another.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Amidzic et al 2006/0064028, Connelly et al 6993381, Hursh 6579233, and Cady et al 6416472 all show similar devices that evaluate cognitive ability in one form or another.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert L. Nasser whose telephone number is 571 272-4731. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor II can be reached on 571 272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3735

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert L. Nasser Primary Examiner Art Unit 3735 Page 4

RLN September 22, 2007

Robert & Mason)